

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.

PLA



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/954,484	09/17/2001	Reuven Gamzon	COLB-117XX	8666

207 7590 10/06/2004

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN, GAGNEBIN & LEOVICI LLP
TEN POST OFFICE SQUARE
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

PITARO, RYAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/954,484

Applicant(s)

GAMZON ET AL.

Examiner

Ryan F Pitaro

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17January2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) ▯ | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-67 have been examined.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. **The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided.** The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 42 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 42 fails to further limit the subject matter of claim 41.

4. Claims 4,6,8,10 are objected to because of the following informalities: "... located adjacent at least..." should be "...located adjacent to at least...". Appropriate correction is required.

5. Claims 26 and 27 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 26 and 27 should be dependent on claim 24 not claim 14 without the claims lacking antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.
6. Claim 49 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 6 of Claim 49 should read, "supplies said at least" instead of "supplies said at lest". Appropriate correction is required.
7. Claim 54 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 8 of claim 54 should be "some client information" instead of "at some client information".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Mousseau et al ("Mousseau", US# 6,779,019).

As per independent claim 1, Mousseau discloses a methodology for providing content to a user via a mobile communicator (Figure 1, item 24) having limited display capabilities, the methodology comprising:

Enabling a user to access a web site via a device other than said mobile communicator (Column 10 lines 56-58)

Enabling a user to select content of interest to the user forming at least part of said content wherein a user selection takes place while the user views at least part of said content of interest (Column 10 lines 56-58)

As per claim 3, which is independent on claim 1, Mousseau discloses a methodology wherein said user selection may be effected by at least one mouse click on at least a portion of said content of interest (Column 10 lines 58-65).

10. Claims 21-27,30-35,37,45-57,58,61-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Laursen et al ("Laursen", US# 66065120).

As per independent claim 21, Laursen discloses a methodology for providing content to a user via a mobile communicator (Figure 2a item 124) having limited display capabilities (Column 7 lines 5-11) the methodology comprising:

enabling a user to access at least one web site via a device other than said mobile communicator (Column 8 lines 29-34);

enabling a user to select multiple items of interest to be provided for display on said mobile communicator (Column 14 lines 59-62); and

displaying at least a plurality of said multiple items of interest for simultaneous viewing on said mobile communicator (Column 15 lines 1-4).

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 21, Laursen discloses a methodology wherein said multiple items of interest originate from multiple web sites (Column 15 lines 1-8).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 22, Laursen discloses a methodology wherein said multiple websites are not necessarily linked (Column 15 lines 1-8).

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 21, Laursen discloses a methodology automatically providing a link from at least one of the said multiple items of interest to mobile communicator-configured content (Column 14 lines 59-62); and

Displaying at least said mobile communicator-configured content on said mobile communicator (Column 15 lines 1-4).

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 24, Laursen discloses a methodology wherein said mobile communicator-configured content includes at least part of said at least one of said multiple items of interest selected by said user (Column 15 lines 1-8)

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 24, Laursen discloses a methodology wherein said mobile communicator-configured content includes at least part of said at least one of said multiple items of interest selected by said user and also includes other content related thereto (Column 15 lines 1-8; *wherein bookmarks include further information when viewed*).

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 24, Laursen discloses a methodology wherein said mobile communicator-configured content includes at least part of said at least one of said multiple items of interest selected by said user as well as other content related thereto which was not viewed by the user on said device other than said mobile communicator (Column 15 lines 1-8; *through bookmarks taken to a webpage which any of the links on the page can be viewed*).

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 28, Laursen discloses a methodology automatically updating said at least one page to include therein content of interest which was not available generally in real time (Column 15 lines 3-8; *wherein stock tips automatically update when viewing page*).

As per independent claim 31, Laursen discloses a methodology for providing content to a user via a mobile communicator (Figure 2a item 124) having limited display capabilities (Column 7 lines 5-11), the methodology comprising:

enabling a user to select content of interest at at least one web site via a device other than said mobile communicator (Column 8 lines 29-34);

automatically providing a link from said content of interest to mobile communicator-configured content (Column 14 lines 59-62); and

displaying at least said mobile communicator-configured content on said mobile communicator (Column 15 lines 1-4).

As per claim 32, which is dependent on claim 31, Laursen discloses a methodology wherein said mobile communicator-configured content includes at least part of said content of interest selected by said user (Column 8 lines 29-34).

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 31, Laursen discloses a methodology wherein said mobile communicator-configured content includes at least part of said content of interest selected by said user and also includes other content related thereto (Column 15 lines 1-8; *wherein bookmarks include further information when viewed*).

As per claim 34 which is dependent of claim 33, Laursen discloses a methodology wherein said mobile communicator-configured content includes at least part of said content of interest selected by said user as well as other content related thereto which was not viewed by the user on said device other than said mobile communicator (Column 15 lines 1-8; *through bookmarks taken to a webpage which any of the links on the page can be viewed*).

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 31, Laursen discloses a methodology comprising:

Enabling said user to select said content of interest to the user on said at least one web site for display to the user on said mobile communicator (column 8 lines 5-11) in the form of at least one page appearing in a mobile communicator-configured format (Column 10 lines 38-46); and

In response to a user request to receive said at least one page, downloading at least part of said content of interest from said at least one web site generally in real time (Column 10 lines 53-63).

As per claim 37, which is dependent on claim 35, Laursen discloses a methodology automatically updating said at least one page to include therein content of interest which was not available generally in real time (Column 15 lines 3-8; *wherein stock tips automatically update when viewing page*).

As per claim independent claim 45, Laursen discloses a methodology for providing content to a user mobile communicator (Figure 2a item 124) having limited display capabilities (Column 7 lines 5-11), the methodology comprising:

providing at least one user interface server (Figure 2a item 128);

receiving and storing least one user preference at said at least one user interface server (Column 7 lines 40-46);

collecting information from plurality of web servers at least partially accordance with said at least one user preference (Column 8 lines 30-33);

and supplying at least part of said information to said at least one mobile communicator (Column 8 lines 33-34).

As per claim 46, which is dependent on claim 45, Laursen discloses a methodology wherein said at least one user preference is received from computer rather than from a mobile communicator (Column 8 lines 30-34).

As per claim 47, which is dependent on claim 45, Laursen discloses a methodology according said at least one user preference is received from a mobile communicator (Column 13 lines 40-41).

As per claim 48, which is dependent on claim 45, Laursen discloses a methodology comprising

receiving, at said at least one user interface server (Figure 2a item 128), at least one request from at least one mobile communicator (Column 13 lines 47-52); and wherein:

said at least one user interface server is operative for collecting said information responsive to said at least one request (Column 7 lines 20-24).

As per claim 49, which is dependent on claim 48, Laursen discloses a methodology wherein said at least one user preference is received by said at least one user interface server at a time substantially earlier than the time at which at least one request and supplies said at least part of said information to said at least one mobile communicator (Column 8 lines 30-34;*wherein the user must first select preference before it can be displayed on the mobile communicator*).

As per claim 50, which is dependent on claim 46, Laursen discloses a methodology wherein said computer provides personal user preferences of multiple users (Column 14 lines 34-52;*wherein logon information is required so that multiple users may access preferences through the same computer*).

As per independent claim 51, Laursen discloses a methodology for providing content to a user a mobile communicator (Figure 2a item 124) having limited display capabilities (Column 8 lines 30-33), the methodology comprising enabling user select content of interest (Column 8 lines 30-33) the user on a mark up language rendered page viewable to the user (Column 8 lines 29-33), wherein at least certain instances

when user selects said content of interest, mobile communicator specific data linked to said content of interest made available for use by said mobile communicator (Column 8 lines 33-34).

As per claim 52, which is dependent on claim 51, Laursen discloses a methodology wherein said data includes at least one of:

An address of at least on e mobile communicator formatted page (Column 14 lines 59-62;*bookmark*);

A function that enables retrieval of information from a web server;(Column 8 lines 29-34)

At least part of information required for executing commercial transaction (Column 6 lines 35-43).

As per claim 53, which is dependent on claim 53, Laursen discloses a methodology wherein said at least part of information required for executing a commercial transaction includes a function that enables retrieval of client information by said web server (Column 6 lines 35-43*whering the client and web server exchange information through the browser*).

As per claim 54, which is dependent on claim 51, Laursen discloses a methodology wherein said data includes at least one of:

An address of at least on e mobile communicator formatted page (Column 14 lines 59-62;*bookmark*);

A function that enables retrieval of information from a web server;(Column 8 lines 29-34); and

And some client information (Column 13 lines 60-67).

As per independent claim 55, Laursen discloses a methodology for providing dynamically changing information to a user comprising:

selecting by a user of dynamic content of interest while the user views said content of interest on a dynamically changing web site (Column 8 lines 30-31;*stock quotes*);

in response to said user selecting said dynamic content of interest, automatically analyzing the context of said content of interest on said web site (Column 8 lines 30-31;*stock quotes*); and

thereafter automatically providing to said user substantially only said content of interest which was selected by said user, notwithstanding dynamic changes in the said content of interest and notwithstanding at least some changes in said context in said dynamically changing website(Column 8 lines 33-34).

As per independent claim 56, Laursen discloses a system for providing content to a user via a mobile communicator (Figure 2a item124) having limited display capabilities (Column 7 lines 5-11), the system comprising enabling a user to select content of interest (Column 15 lines 4-9) to the user on a mark up language rendered page viewable to the user (Column 15 lines 14-18), wherein at least in certain instances when the user selects said content of interest, mobile communicator specific data linked to

said content of interest is made available for use by said mobile communicator (Column lines 59-62).

As per independent claim 57, Laursen discloses a system for providing content to a user via a mobile communicator (Figure 2a item 124) having limited display capabilities (Column 7 lines 5-11), the system comprising:

at least one user interface server receiving and storing at least one user preference (Column 7 lines 40-44);

an information collector operative to collect information from a plurality of web servers at least partially in accordance with said at least one user preference (Column 8 lines 29-32);

and an information communicator supplying at least part of said information to said at least one mobile communicator (Column 8 lines 33-34).

As per independent claim 58, Laursen discloses a content selector operative to receive from a user a selection of dynamic content of interest while displaying said content of interest to the user on a dynamically changing web site (Column 8 lines 30-34, *such as a list of stock symbols*);

a context analyzer operative, in response to said user selecting said dynamic content of interest, to automatically analyze the context of said content of interest on said web site (Column 8 lines 30-34); and

a content provider operative, thereafter, to automatically provide to said user substantially only said content of interest which was selected by said user,

notwithstanding dynamic changes in the said content of interest and notwithstanding at least some changes in said context in said dynamically changing website (Column 15 lines 1-4;*wherein by listing the stock symbols they are updated by the web server whenever website is visited through the mobile communicator*).

As per independent claim 61, Laursen discloses a methodology providing content to a user via a communicator having limited display capabilities (Column 7 lines 5-11) the methodology comprising:

enabling a user to access a web site via a device other than said communicator, said device having display capabilities, which exceed those of said communicator (Column 7 lines 5-12);

enabling a user to view content on said web site (Column 8 lines 29-32); and

enabling a user to select content of interest to the user forming at least part of said content (Column 15 lines 4-9), wherein a user selection takes place while the user views at least part of said content of interest (Column 15 lines 4-9).

As per independent claim 62, Laursen discloses a methodology for providing content to a user via a communicator having limited display capabilities (Column 7 lines 5-11), the methodology comprising:

enabling a user to access a web site via a device other than said communicator (Column 8 lines 29-34), said device having display capabilities, which exceed those of said communicator (Column 7 lines 5-12);

enabling a user to view content on said web site (Column 8 lines 29-32); and
enabling a user to select content of interest to the user forming at least part of
said content (Column 15 lines 4-9), wherein a user selection takes place while the user
views at least part of said content of interest (Column 15 lines 4-9).

As per independent claim 63, Laursen discloses a system for providing content to
a user via a mobile communicator (Figure 2a item 124) having limited display
capabilities (Column 7 lines 5-11), the system comprising:

a website access device enabling a user to access a web site via a device other
than the mobile communicator (Column 8 lines 29-34);

a selector enabling the user to select multiple items of interest to be provided for
display on said mobile communicator (Column 14 lines 59-62); and

a simultaneous viewer operative to display at least a plurality of said multiple
items of interest for simultaneous viewing on said mobile communicator (Column 15
lines 1-4).

As per independent claim 64, Laursen discloses a system for providing content to
a user via a mobile communicator (Figure 2a item 124) having limited display
capabilities (Column 7 lines 5-11), the system comprising:

a website content selection device enabling a user to select content of interest at
at least one web site via a device other than the mobile communicator (Column 8 lines
5-11);

a link provider automatically providing a link from said content of interest to mobile communicator-configured content (Column 14 lines 59-62); and

a content display generator operative to display at least said mobile communicator-configured content on said mobile communicator (Column 15 lines 1-4).

As per independent claim 65, Laursen discloses a system for providing content to a user via a mobile communicator (Figure 2a item 124) having limited display capabilities (Column 7 lines 5-11), the system comprising:

a content selector enabling a user to select content of interest to the user on at least one web site for display to the user on said mobile communicator (Column 8 lines 5-11) in the form of at least one page appearing in a mobile communicator-configured format (Column 10 lines 38-46); and

a real time content downloader operative in response to a user request to receive said at least one page, to download at least part of said content of interest from said at least one web site generally in real time (Column 10 lines 53-63).

11. Claims 38,39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Tsimelzon ("Tsimelzon", US# 6,763,388).

As per independent claim 38, Tsimelzon discloses a methodology for providing content to a user via mobile communicator having limited display capabilities (Column 4 lines 14-20), the methodology comprising:

Enabling a user to select content of interest to the user on at least on web site for display to the user on said mobile communicator (Column 8 lines 5-11) in the form of at

Art Unit: 2174

least on e page appearing in mobile communicator-configured format (Column 10 lines 38-46)

In response to a user request to receive said at least one page, downloading at least part of said content of interest from said at least one web site generally in real time (Column 10 lines 53-63).

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 38, Tsimelzon discloses a methodology wherein said at least on page comprises a single page (Column 6 lines 7-15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 2,4,7,8,11,15,18,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mousseau et al ("Mousseau", US# 6,779,019) in further view of Tsimelzon ("Tsimelzon", US# 6,763,388).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Mousseau fails to distinctly point out a user selection while the user views the normal page. However, Tsimelzon teaches a methodology wherein said user selection takes place while the user views at least part of said content of interest in the format that it normally appears on said web site (Column 7 lines 1-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Mousseau's methodology for providing content to a mobile

communicator with Tsimelzon's teaching. Motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to capture the content that is in the format to ensure the user to select and sends the correct information.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Mousseau fails to distinctly point out a mouse click on an icon. However, Tsimelzon teaches a methodology wherein the user selection may be effected by at least one portion of said content of interest (Column 8 lines 5-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Mousseau's methodology for providing content to a mobile communicator with Tsimelzon's teaching. Motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to easily select the content of interest.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 2, Mousseau discloses a methodology wherein user selection may be effected by at least one mouse click on at least a portion of said content of interest (Column 10 lines 58-65).

Claim 8 is similar to scope to claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Mousseau fails to distinctly point out a selection of multiple items. However Tsimelzon teaches a methodology wherein the user selection includes user selection of multiple items of interest to be provided for display on said mobile communicator (Column 8 lines 5-11) and said mobile communicator is operative for displaying at least a plurality of said multiple items of interest for simultaneous viewing thereon (Figure 7; *wherein user can select more than one item by show/hide to show on display*). Therefore it would have been obvious to an

artisan at the time of the invention to combine Mousseau's methodology for providing content to a mobile communicator with Tsimelzon's teaching. Motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to select more than one item to utilize screen space and to limit the navigation of multiple pages.

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, Mousseau fails to distinctly point out mobile communicator-configured content including a selection of interest. However, Tsimelzon teaches a methodology wherein the mobile communicator-configured content includes at least part of said content of interest selected by said user (Column 8 lines 5-11). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Mousseau's methodology for providing content to a mobile communicator with Tsimelzon's teaching. Motivation to do so would have been so that the user's selection would be viewed on the users mobile phone.

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 1, Mousseau fails to distinctly point out viewing the web page of user selection on the mobile communicator. However, Tsimelzon teaches a methodology enabling said user to select said content of interest tot the user on said at least one web site for display to the user on said mobile communicator (Column 8 lines 5-11) in the form of at least one page appearing in a mobile communicator-configured format (Column 10 lines 38-46); and in response to a user request to receive at least on page, downloading at least part of said content of interest from said at least one web site generally in real time (Column 10 lines 53-63). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Mousseau's methodology for providing content to a mobile communicator with

Tsimelzon's teaching. Motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to view the web page in its entirety so that the user is not limited to only the selected content.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 18, Mousseau fails to distinctly point out at least one page comprising a single page. However, Tsimelzon teaches at least one page comprising a single page (Column 6 lines 7-15).

14. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mousseau et al ("Mousseau", US# 6,779,019) in further view of Laursen et al ("Laursen", US# 6,065,120).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 1, Mousseau fails to distinctly point out automatically providing a link from selection. However, Laursen teaches a methodology comprising automatically providing a link from said content of interest to mobile communicator-configured content (Column 14 lines 59-62); and displaying at least said mobile communicator-configured content on said mobile communicator (Column 15 lines 1-4). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Mousseau's methodology with Laursen teaching. Motivation to do so would have been so the user could easily view the page related content through the link.

15. Claims 12,13,16,17,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mousseau et al ("Mousseau", US# 6,779,019) and Tsimelzon

("Tsimelzon", US# 6,763,388) in further view of Laursen et al ("Laursen", US# 6,065,120).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, the modified Mousseau fails to distinctly point out multiple items being from multiple web sites. However, Laursen teaches multiple items of interest originating from multiple web sites (Column 15 lines 1-8). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the modified Mousseau's methodology with Laursen's teaching. Motivation to do so would have been so that the user can take advantage of the small screen size by viewing multiple items from multiple pages limiting the navigation between sites.

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, the modified Mousseau fail to distinctly point out the multiple sites not being linked. However, Laursen teaches said multiple web sites are not necessarily lined (Column 15 lines 1-8).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 14, the modified Mousseau fails to distinctly point out related content to the selected content. However, Laursen teaches a methodology wherein said mobile communicator-configured content includes at least part of said content of interest selected by said user and also includes other content related thereto (Column 15 lines 1-8; *wherein bookmarks include further information when viewed*). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the modified Mousseau's methodology with Laursen's teaching. Motivation to do so would have been to allow the users to view more than just the selectable content of interest.

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 14, the modified Mousseau fails to distinctly point other content only delivered to the mobile communicator. However,

Laursen teaches a methodology wherein said mobile communicator-configured content includes at least part of said content of interest selected by said user as well as other content related thereto which was not viewed by the user on said device other than said mobile communicator (Column 15 lines 1-8; *through bookmarks taken to a webpage which any of the links on the page can be viewed*). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the modified Mousseau's methodology with Laursen's teaching. Motivation to do so would have been to allow the users to view more than just the selectable content of interest on the mobile communicator without forcing the user to select the content on the device other than the mobile communicator.

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 18, the modified Mousseau fails to distinctly point updating a page, which was not available in real time. However Laursen teaches a methodology automatically updating said at least one page to include therein content of interest which was not available generally in real time (Column 15 lines 3-8; *wherein stock tips automatically update when viewing page*). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the modified Mousseau's methodology with Laursen's teaching. Motivation to do so would have been so that the users can view the information in real time.

16. Claims 5,6,9, and10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Laursen et al ("Laursen", US# 6,065,120).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim1, Laursen fails to distinctly point out a dragging and dropping the selection of interest. However, Official Notice is taken that

dragging and dropping is notoriously well know in the art examples of which are moving icons on a desktop or transferring mp3s to a mp3 player through dragging and dropping mp3s into a certain folder. Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Laursen's methodology with the current teaching of dragging and dropping. Motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to easily select the content of interest.

As per claim 6, which is dependent of claim 1, Laursen fails to distinctly point out a dragging and dropping of an icon. However, Official Notice is taken that dragging and dropping is notoriously well know in the art examples of which are moving icons on a desktop or transferring mp3s to a mp3 player through dragging and dropping mp3s into a certain folder. Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Laursen's methodology with the current teaching of dragging and dropping. Motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to easily select the content of interest.

Claim 9 is similar to scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 10 is similar to scope to claim 6, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

17. Claims 28-29,36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Laursen et al ("Laursen", US# 6,065,120) in further view of Tsimelzon ("Tsimelzon", US# 6,763,388).

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 21, Laursen fails to distinctly point out downloading content of interest in real time. However, Tsimelzon teaches a methodology enabling said user to select said content of interest to the user on said mobile communicator (Column 8 lines 5-11) from of at least one page appearing in a mobile communicator-configured format (Column 10 lines 38-46) in response to a user request to receive at least one page, downloading at least part of said content of interest from said at least one website generally in real time (Column 10 lines 53-63). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Laursen's methodology with Tsimelzon's teaching. Motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to see the information in real time.

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 28, Laursen fails to distinctly point out at least one page comprising a single page. However, Tsimelzon teaches at least one page comprising a single page (Column 6 lines 7-15).

Claim 36 is similar to scope to claim 29, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

18. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Tsimelzon ("Tsimelzon", US# 6,763,388) in further view of Laursen et al ("Laursen", US# 6,065,120).

As per claim 40, which is dependent on claim 38, Tsimelzon fails to distinctly point out automatically updating a page, which was not available in real time. However Laursen teaches a methodology automatically updating said at least one page to include therein content of interest which was not available generally in real time

(Column 15 lines 3-8; *wherein stock tips automatically update when viewing page*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Tsimelzon's methodology with Laursen's teaching. Motivation to do so would have been so that the users can view the information in real time.

19. Claims 41-44, 59, 60, 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Laursen et al ("Laursen", US# 6,065,120) in further view of Nguyen ("Nguyen", US# 6,564,250).

As per independent claim 41, Laursen discloses a methodology for providing content to a user via a mobile communicator (Figure 2a item 124) having limited display capabilities (Column 7 lines 5-11), the methodology comprising enabling a user to select content of interest (Column 15 lines 4-9) on a markup language rendered page viewable to the user (Column 15 lines 14-18)

Laursen fails to disclose a user specifiable resolution. However, Nguyen teaches the user is enabled to specify selected content to a resolution finer than the defined by tags of said mark up language (Column 4 lines 40-47) Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the methodology of Laursen with the teaching of Nguyen. Motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to fit view the selected content at a resolution, which they are comfortable with.

Claim 42 is similar to scope to claim 41, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 43, which is dependent on claim 41, Laursen and Nguyen disclose a methodology, wherein said user is enable to select said content of interest when

viewing said mark up language rendered page other than on a screen of a mobile communicator (Column 8 lines 29-34)

As per claim independent claim 44, Laursen discloses a methodology for providing content to a user via a mobile communicator (Figure 2a item 124) having limited display capabilities (Column 7 lines 5-11) the methodology comprising enabling a user to select content of interest (Column 15 lines 4-9) to the user on a mark up language rendered page viewable to the user (Column 15 lines 14-18).

Laursen fails to disclose a user-selected resolution. However, Nguyen teaches the content specifically selectable by the user to a user selected resolution includes: at least some content which is designated by tags to at least said user-selected resolution (Column 4 lines 40-47); at least some content which is designated by tags to a resolution coarser than said user-selected resolution (Column 4 lines 18-27). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the methodology of Laursen with the teaching of Nguyen. Motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to fit view the selected content at a resolution, which they are comfortable with.

Claims 59 and 66 are similar to scope to claim 41, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 60, which is dependent on claim 59, Laursen fails to disclose an html tag where the content has a finer resolution at the sub-tag level. However, Nguyen teaches the content having finer resolution comprising of the content at the sub-tag level (Column 4 lines 40-48; *wherein the graphic element is located at the sub-tag level*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the methodology of Laursen with the teaching of Nguyen. Motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to fit view the selected content at a resolution, which they are comfortable with.

Claim 67 is similar to scope to claim 44, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan Pitaro whose telephone number is (703) 605-1205. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Monday through Thursday, and every other Friday. The Patent Office is moving, after mid October the new telephone number where Ryan Pitaro can be reached is (571) 272 – 4071.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2174

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100